<u>REMARKS</u>

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1-11 remain in the application and are subject to examination. Claim 11 has been amended.

Under the heading "Specification" on page 2 of the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner objected to the specification because it contains a hyperlink. Applicant appreciates the indication of the problem and has deleted the hyperlink.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103" on page 2 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 1-11 have been rejected as being obvious over the admitted prior art in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,275,498 to Bisceglia et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Applicant respectfully traverses with regard to claim 1 and claim 11 has been amended to better define the invention.

Claim 11 has been amended to define a primary terminal having a first address for wirelessly interchanging data packets with a first group of secondary terminals and a second address for wirelessly interchanging data packets with a second group of secondary terminals.

Support for the changes can be found by referring to the specification at page 5, lines 8-22, for example.

The admitted prior art is a wireless data transmission system operating on the Bluetooth standard. Data packets are wirelessly interchanged between a primary terminal and a number of secondary terminals by assigning timeslots (see, specification, page 1, lines 13-18) and by using a frequency hopping method (see, specification, page 3, lines 5-10).

Let us consider the specific teaching in Bisceglia et al. in detail to determine exactly what is taught and what might have been considered obvious in view of that teaching. Bisceglia et al. show a prior art port with a MII Management Interface that can only address 32 PHYs over a single management bus (column 1, line 56 through column 2, line 2 and column 4, lines 11-33). The port can be part of a router, for example (column 1, lines 19-21). Bisceglia et al. teach using a plurality of management buses so that a single processor 34 can control more PHYs than was possible in the prior art (column 2, lines 41-45 and column 4, lines 42-64). The processor 34 drives select lines 36 to select which management bus, which is coupled to the control logic 32, will be active (column 5, lines 5-37).

There is no teaching in Bisceglia et al. that would make it obvious to provide a first terminal with <u>two addresses</u> used for connection identification. If one tries

to make an analogy between the admitted prior art and the teaching in

Bisceglia et al., perhaps the processor 34 in Bisceglia et al could be considered

to be a primary terminal and the PHY's could be considered to be secondary

terminals. Since the processor activates only one management bus (30A or

30b) at a time using select lines 36, there is no need for the processor to have

two addresses for connection identification. Applicants believe it is clear that

Bisceglia et al. do not teach or suggest that the processor has two addresses

for connection identification. Therefore, applicant believes that one of ordinary

skill in the art considering the disclosure of Bisceglia et al. would not obtain any

information that would lead to a modification to the admitted prior art in a way

that would result in the invention defined by claims 1 and 11.

The Examiner has stated that a MAC interface has a unique address and that it

would have been "desirable to have multiple interfaces on an access point

(router) because it would allow multiple networks to be manageable by one

device". This statement of the Examiner combined with the teaching of the

multiple PHY control bus configuration in Bisceglia et al. may support a

modification to a router in a wire-based network, however, applicant

respectfully asserts that the statement does not support a modification to a

system performing data packet interchange by radio as in the admitted prior art

system.

Additionally, Bisceglia et al. teach data interchange performed exclusively by

hardware busses in a hardwired computer network, for example Ethernet or

Fast Ethernet (column 1, lines 24-27). Applicant believes that Bisceglia et al. do not teach anything that would lead to an obvious change in a wireless data transmission system.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claims 1 or 11. Claims 1 and 11 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art. The dependent claims are believed to be patentable as well because they all are ultimately dependent on claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-11 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate receiving a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

Please charge any fees that might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and

1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP, No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

/Laurence A. Greenberg/
Laurence A. Greenberg
(Reg. No. 29,308)

MPW/bb

August 29, 2007

Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP
P.O. Box 2480
Hollywood, Florida 33022-2480
Tel.: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101